

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 9, 2008.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, and 13-20 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8, 10, and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,701) in view of Bickmore (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102) in further view of Lamming et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,321).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends claims 2, 10, 13, and 20, and adds new claim 21, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-3, 8, 10, and 13-21. Reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following arguments is respectfully requested.

III. Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,701, hereinafter Malik) in view of Bickmore (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102, hereinafter Bickmore) in further view of Lamming (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,321, hereinafter Lamming).

Claim 1

Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Previously presented) A method for providing access to services when a Web page is accessed by a mobile device user comprising the steps of:
receiving a URL from a user;
retrieving one or more links parsed from a Web page identified by the URL;
displaying to the mobile device the one or more links in a list format;
receiving a user selection through the mobile device of a given one of the links from the list of links;
retrieving one or more service menu items corresponding to one or more services, the one or more services comprising programs to perform functions for the given link;
and*

displaying to the mobile device the one or more service menu items for selection by the user.

Claim 1 requires retrieving one or more *links* parsed from a Web page identified by the URL. Support for this element can be found in the specification at p. 10, lines 21-25, which states that the document received from the server is then parsed and hyper-links provided in the document are separated from the content. For clarification, the terms “link” and “hyper-link,” are synonymous, as used in the specification.

Bickmore discloses re-authoring of documents originally designed for display on a desktop computer screen for display on a smaller display screen, such as those used with a PDA or cellular telephone. Re-authoring converts the document into a number of pages, where each page is fully displayable with only at most a minimal amount of scrolling on the display screen of the PDA or cellular phone. For example, in Fig. 1, the document 100 is converted into a *list of sections page 110*. The contents 106 of each section 102 of the document 100 is elided from the document 100, and each section is elided into a page 111 (should be 112 in Fig. 1). Each *section header 104 is converted into a hypertext link*. When the hypertext link for any section is selected, the corresponding page [112] of elided content is loaded into the browser. (abstract; col. 8, lines 17-23).

Claim 1 requires retrieving one or more links parsed from a Web page identified by the URL. For clarification, “hypertext link,” as used in Bickmore, is synonymous with “link” or “hyper-link, as used in the specification. Bickmore converts a document 100 into a list of sections page 110. In other words, Bickmore parses a document (Web page) for section headers 104. These section headers are then converted into hypertext links for selection by the user. Thus, the section headers 104 parsed from a Web page are not the same as the one or more links parsed from a Web page, as required by claim 1.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Malik, Bickmore and Lamming fail to teach or suggest retrieving one or more links parsed from a Web page identified by the URL, as required by claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Malik, Bickmore, or Lamming, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 2

Claim 2 has been amended to require displaying one or more service menu items corresponding to standard services *independent of the given link*. Although the services may all be provided by a single supplier, such as a service provider hosting the m-link browsing software, at least one of the services provided in one embodiment can be configured to be provided by a separate service provider. For example, printing or faxing may be provided through Kinkos or Mail Boxes etc. Emailing can be provided using a specific service such as Microsoft Outlook or Eudora. (Spec., p. 19, lines 15-23).

Lamming discloses service menu items, such as printer and fax service menu items. (col. 7, lines 25-27). Lamming, however, does not teach or suggest standard services independent of the given link. Thus, Lamming does not teach or suggest displaying one or more service menu items corresponding to standard services *independent of the given link*, as required by claim 2.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Malik, Bickmore and Lamming fail to teach or suggest displaying one or more service menu items corresponding to standard services independent of the given link, as required by claim 2. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 2 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Malik, Bickmore, or Lamming, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 13

Claim 13 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. Claim 13, as amended, requires displaying one or more service menu items corresponding to services dependent on a characteristic of the user. Lamming discloses service menu items, such as printer and fax service menu items. (col. 7, lines 25-27). Lamming, however, does not teach or suggest services dependent on a characteristic of the user. Thus, Lamming does not teach or suggest displaying service menu items corresponding to services dependent on a characteristic of the user, as required by claim 13.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Malik, Bickmore and Lamming fail to teach or suggest displaying one or more service menu items corresponding to services dependent on a characteristic of the user, as required by claim 13. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 13 is neither anticipated by, nor

obvious in view of Malik, Bickmore, or Lamming, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 14

Claim 14 requires ordering of the display of links. Lamming discloses that the satchel contents are displayed on screen 50 as a series of one line entries, each line corresponding to a document token and including a small icon and the name of the document. As shown in Fig. 3(b), examples are a document icon 62 for a document named “Wireless Networks,” and a printer icon 65 for a printer named “Penguin.” (col. 7, lines 22-27). Lamming, however, does not teach or suggest the ordering of these lines, and thus does not disclose the ordering of the display of links, as required by claim 14.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Malik, Bickmore and Lamming fail to teach or suggest ordering of the display of links, as required by claim 14. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 14 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Malik, Bickmore, or Lamming, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 8, 10, and 15-19

Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. Claims 3, 8, 10, and 15-19 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable claims discussed above. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 8, 10, and 15-19 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations, which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claim 20

Claim 20 requires that link dependent services comprise services dependent on the content of web pages accessed by the link, the link dependent services including one of owner dependent, format dependent and language dependent services. Claim 20 has been amended to

depend from new claim 21. As discussed below for claim 21, Lamming does not teach or suggest link dependent services. Thus, Lamming does not teach or suggest that link dependent services comprise services dependent on the content of web pages accessed by the link, as required by claim 20.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Malik, Bickmore and Lamming fail to teach or suggest that link dependent services comprise services dependent on the content of web pages accessed by the link, the link dependent services including one of owner dependent, format dependent and language dependent services, as required by claim 20. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 20 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Malik, Bickmore, or Lamming, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Additional Amendment

Claim 21 has been newly added by the present Response. New claim 21 includes the second element of claim 2 that was deleted in the present Response. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being added in new claim 21. Applicants respectfully request that new claim 21 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

New claim 21 requires displaying one or more service menu items corresponding to *link dependent services* as identified by the given link. Support in the specification for this element is on p. 18, lines 22-24, which states that services offered by the content provider are fetched from a database or data file stored at and managed by the site owner. For example, with the IEEE Web site www.ieee.com, a service for ordering a document such as a book or publication from IEEE might be added. (Spec., p. 20, lines 7-9).

Lamming discloses service menu items, such as printer and fax service menu items. (col. 7, lines 25-27). Lamming, however, does not teach or suggest link dependent services as identified by the given link. Thus, Lamming does not teach or suggest displaying one or more service menu items corresponding to *link dependent services* as identified by the given link, as required by claim 21.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Malik, Bickmore and Lamming fail to teach or suggest displaying one or more service menu items corresponding to link dependent services as identified by the given link, as required by claim 21. For at least this reason, Applicants

respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 21 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Malik, Bickmore, or Lamming, taken alone or in combination, and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if she can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for the time to respond up to and including October 9, 2008.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fees and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 9, 2008

By: /Julie Daniels Missud/
Julie Daniels Missud
Reg. No. 51,330

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910